

# **EXHIBIT A**

**Wolek, Adam**

---

**From:** Wolek, Adam  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 7:19 PM  
**To:** 'Mark Figueiredo'  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove; Lambie, Adrian T.; Czerniak, Allison E.  
**Subject:** RE: Parkridge v. Indyzen

Mark,

As we have stated on our prior call and below, January 4 doesn't help us much given our travel schedule for the holidays. Like we offered before, we agree to work with you on whatever dates or extensions you need in turn for your reply brief and the hearing. But we need to know if you don't agree to an extension because we'll need to otherwise file so we can either (1) have our motion for extension be addressed by the Court before the holiday, or (2) cancel our travel plans for Christmas.

Accordingly, while we'd rather not trouble the Court with such motion practice during the holidays (or cancel spending time with our families on Christmas), if you don't agree to our extension request, we will have no choice but to file tonight.

Regards,

Adam

---

**From:** Mark Figueiredo [mailto:mrf@structurelaw.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 7:07 PM  
**To:** Wolek, Adam <awolek@taftlaw.com>  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove <ESolove@structurelaw.com>; Lambie, Adrian T. <alambie@archernorris.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Parkridge v. Indyzen

Adam,

At a minimum, I can agree to January 4 with our reply due January 11. We can talk about a further extension tomorrow. Will that alleviate your need to file tonight?

Mark

---

**From:** Wolek, Adam [mailto:awolek@taftlaw.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 5:03 PM  
**To:** Mark Figueiredo <mrf@structurelaw.com>  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove <ESolove@structurelaw.com>; Lambie, Adrian T. <alambie@archernorris.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Parkridge v. Indyzen

Counsel,

To follow up on my earlier email, we of course are accordingly amenable to work with you on whatever dates that need to be arranged thereafter for your reply brief and the hearing. However, we need to know your response today so our motion for extension could be addressed by the Court before the holiday. Accordingly, while we'd rather not trouble the Court with such motion practice during Christmas, if you do agree to our extension request, we will have no choice but

to file tonight.

Regards,

Adam

---

**From:** Wolek, Adam  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 6:36 PM  
**To:** 'Mark Figueiredo' <[mrf@structurelaw.com](mailto:mrf@structurelaw.com)>  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove <[ESolove@structurelaw.com](mailto:ESolove@structurelaw.com)>; Lambie, Adrian T. <[alambie@archernorris.com](mailto:alambie@archernorris.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Parkridge v. Indyzen

Mark,

Given that there are two major holidays imminently approaching, please let us know if you agree to an extension for a response to at least January 10. Again, we would rather file a stipulation than go through the necessity of motion practice for filing for an extension of time, particularly as we'd like to avoid burdening the Court during the upcoming holidays.

Regards,

Adam

---

**From:** Mark Figueiredo [<mailto:mrf@structurelaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 6:31 PM  
**To:** Wolek, Adam <[awolek@taftlaw.com](mailto:awolek@taftlaw.com)>  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove <[ESolove@structurelaw.com](mailto:ESolove@structurelaw.com)>; Lambie, Adrian T. <[alambie@archernorris.com](mailto:alambie@archernorris.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Parkridge v. Indyzen

Adam,

January 18 will not work for our reply if that is the hearing date.

Mark

---

**From:** Wolek, Adam [<mailto:awolek@taftlaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 4:21 PM  
**To:** Mark Figueiredo <[mrf@structurelaw.com](mailto:mrf@structurelaw.com)>  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove <[ESolove@structurelaw.com](mailto:ESolove@structurelaw.com)>; Lambie, Adrian T. <[alambie@archernorris.com](mailto:alambie@archernorris.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Parkridge v. Indyzen

Thanks Mark. Do you agree to the other dates (the response and reply dates) otherwise?

Regards,

Adam

---

**From:** Mark Figueiredo [<mailto:mrf@structurelaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 6:19 PM  
**To:** Wolek, Adam <[awolek@taftlaw.com](mailto:awolek@taftlaw.com)>  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove <[ESolove@structurelaw.com](mailto:ESolove@structurelaw.com)>; Lambie, Adrian T. <[alambie@archernorris.com](mailto:alambie@archernorris.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Parkridge v. Indyzen

Adam,

I am told that the court does not have January 25 available. The staff person who had coordinated with the court is out sick today so I will confirm status tomorrow and let you know.

Mark

---

**From:** Wolek, Adam [<mailto:awolek@taftlaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 4:06 PM  
**To:** Mark Figueiredo <[mrf@structurelaw.com](mailto:mrf@structurelaw.com)>  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove <[ESolove@structurelaw.com](mailto:ESolove@structurelaw.com)>; Lambie, Adrian T. <[alambie@archernorris.com](mailto:alambie@archernorris.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Parkridge v. Indyzen

Counsel,

Please let us know if you agree to our proposed schedule below. If so, please let us know so we can prepare a stipulation for your review. We would rather file a stipulation than go through the necessity of motion practice for filing for an extension of time, particularly as we'd like to avoid motion practice and burdening the Court during the upcoming holidays. Thank you.

Regards,

Adam

---

**From:** Wolek, Adam  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 2:15 PM  
**To:** 'Mark Figueiredo' <[mrf@structurelaw.com](mailto:mrf@structurelaw.com)>  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove <[ESolove@structurelaw.com](mailto:ESolove@structurelaw.com)>; Lambie, Adrian T. <[alambie@archernorris.com](mailto:alambie@archernorris.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Parkridge v. Indyzen

Hi Mark,

January 4 doesn't help us too much given the holidays, New Year and our travel schedule. We're ok with postponing the hearing date by a week. How about a response due January 10, your reply due January 18, and a hearing January 25?

Best,

Adam

---

**From:** Mark Figueiredo [<mailto:mrf@structurelaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 19, 2017 2:07 PM  
**To:** Wolek, Adam <[awolek@taftlaw.com](mailto:awolek@taftlaw.com)>  
**Cc:** Ethan Solove <[ESolove@structurelaw.com](mailto:ESolove@structurelaw.com)>; Lambie, Adrian T. <[alambie@archernorris.com](mailto:alambie@archernorris.com)>  
**Subject:** Parkridge v. Indyzen

Adam,

The hearing date on our motion to compel arbitration is set for January 18. Accordingly, we could not extend your time to oppose from December 28 to January 18 without postponing the hearing. How about January 4 for your opposition with our reply due January 11, and the hearing proceeding on January 18?

Mark R. Figueiredo  
Structure Law Group, LLP  
1754 Technology Drive, Suite 135  
San Jose, CA 95110  
(408) 441-7500  
(408) 228-8787 fax  
[www.structurelaw.com](http://www.structurelaw.com)

This E-mail is an electronic communication under the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510, and its disclosure is strictly limited to the intended recipient. This E-mail may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient and receipt by anyone other than the intended recipient does not constitute a loss of the confidential or privileged nature of the communication. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by return electronic mail and delete all copies of this communication.

## Taft /

**Adam Wolek** / Partner  
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP  
111 E. Wacker Drive, Suite 2800  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-3713  
Tel: 312.527.4000 • Fax: 312.966.8598  
Direct: 312.836.4063 • Cell: 312.860.9006  
[www.taftlaw.com](http://www.taftlaw.com) / [awolek@taftlaw.com](mailto:awolek@taftlaw.com)

[Subscribe to our law updates](#)

This message may contain information that is attorney-client privileged, attorney work product or otherwise confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, use and disclosure of this message are prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.